



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,563	01/21/2000	Stuart Kent Card	07447.0026-00000	4607
22852	7590	09/28/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2179

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/488,563	CARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5-9,14-17 and 24-40 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 5-9,14-17 and 24-40 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Applicant's Response***

In Applicant's Response dated 3 September 2004, Applicant amended Claims 5, 14 and 24, added new Claims 25-40, cancelled Claims 1-4, 10-13 and 18-23, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 3 June 2004.

***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the “**virtual** board” in Claims 5, 14 and 24 (see Claim 5, Line 11), the generation of an “**extended document**” in Claim 25 (see Line 11) and the spreading activation procedure that provides information “as a function of **user-provided relational information**” in Claim 33 (see Lines 1-2).

Regarding the “virtual board” of Claims 5, 14 and 24, the “display of information” (see Claim 5, Line 10) is shown on a user interface comprising a “window divided into a view of medium contents area on the left and an HTML browser area [on the right]” (see Specification, Page 28, Lines 18-21). The upper part of the medium contents area is a “content board” (see Specification, Page 28, Lines 21-22) and the lower part is a “citation board” (see Specification, Page 29, Line 7). However, the specification fails to mention a “**virtual** board,” as recited in Claims 5, 14 and 24.

For purposes of examination, the examiner will interpret the “virtual board” to simply be a graphical user interface.

Regarding the “extended document” of Claim 25, this very likely is an attempt to broadly claim the collection of database objects displayed in the window of Figure 12. However, the specification fails to mention an “extended document,” as recited in Claim 25.

For purposes of examination, the examiner will interpret the “extended document” to simply be a collection of objects displayed in a graphical user interface.

Regarding the “spreading activation” of Claim 33, the examiner found nothing in the specification that mentioned a spreading activation that provides information based on ***“user-provided relational information.”***

For purposes of examination, the examiner will interpret the “user-provided relational information” to simply be any information that is input by the user.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “provided information” in Line 2 should be amended to — information related to the source material — because that is how the element is previously

identified (see Claim 37, Line 2); for purposes of examination, the examiner will assume that the claims was intended to read as suggested.

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "is executed is" in Line 2 should be amended to — is executed as — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 25-31, 35, 37, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goffman, U.S. Patent No. 5,594,897.

*Claim 25:*

Goffman discloses a method of producing a storage medium that provides information regarding a source material (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — Goffman discloses this limitation in that the information retrieval system collects a set of relevant objects into a library from an overall source collection), comprising the steps of:

- gathering features of the source material (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — Goffman discloses this limitation in that the method selects a “starter” journal as the “source material” and gathers citations of “other” journals in the starter journal; these citations are the “gathered features”);
- accessing secondary materials related to the features (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — the “secondary materials” are the “other” journals, which are “accessed” by the information retrieval system in order to determine how relevant the “other” journals are to the “starter” journal; these “secondary materials” are “related to the features” in that the “features” are citations to these journals);
- gathering features of the secondary materials (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — the “features” are the citations of additional journals in the “other” journals);
- determining attributes of the gathered materials, wherein the source material, the features of the source material, the secondary materials, the features of the secondary materials, and the attributes of the gathered materials are

- characterized as objects of the storage medium (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2; see Column 14, Lines 34-47 — the “attributes” of the “gathered materials” include the “relevance values,” which are “determined” by the information retrieval system; the “starter” journal, the “other” journals, the citations of additional journals, and the “relevance values” are “characterized as objects of the storage medium” in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network; in other words, each of these elements is an “object” that is manipulated by the computer network);
- analyzing the attributes based on a predetermined characteristic (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — the “predetermined characteristic” is the “threshold relevance value;” the information retrieval system “analyzes” the “attributes” by comparing the relevance value of each journal to the “threshold” relevance value); and
- generating an extended document capable of variable electronic dissemination as a function of the analysis (see Figures 4 and 5; see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2; see Tables 1-10 in Columns 15-20 – the “extended document” is generated and recorded in the digraphs, tables and trees, as described in the cited text and figures; the “extended document” is “capable of variable electronic dissemination as a function of the analysis” in that the user can adjust the “threshold relevance value” and redo the analysis), wherein the storage medium includes relational information between the objects of the storage medium that is adapted to be graphically depicted on a user interface (see Figures 4-12; see

Column 4, Line 51 through Column 5, Line 10; see Column 14, Lines 34-47; see Tables 1-10 in Columns 15-20 – the “storage medium” includes “relational information between the objects of the storage medium” in that the information recorded in the tables, digraphs and trees pertain to the relevance between the various journals and a numerical measure of that relevance; the “relational information” is “adapted to be graphically depicted on a user interface” in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network, as indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 26:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 25, wherein the relational information includes a database of linkages between the objects of the storage medium (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 – the “relational information” includes “linkages between the objects” in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network and the “starter” journal cites each of the “other” journals).

*Claim 27:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein the hierarchy of the linkage database of the extended document is adapted to be displayed via graphical indicia (see Figures 4-12; see Column 4, Line 51 through Column 5, Line 10; see Column 14, Lines 34-47; see Tables 1-10 in Columns 15-20 – the “linkage database” is set up in a “hierarchy,” as shown in Figures 4-12; the “hierarchy” is “adapted to be displayed via

graphical indicia" in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network, as indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 28:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 25, wherein the extended document is adapted to be displayed via graphical indicia such that selection of a desired relational quality by the user causes the display to graphically indicate which objects or content shares the same relation with the source material (see Column 8, Line 3 through Column 9, Line 13 — as indicated in the above discussion, the "relational information" is "adapted to be graphically depicted on a user interface" in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network; as indicated in the cited text, the user can increase or decrease the threshold value until new journals are added to or subtracted from the collected set of "other" journals; thus, the information retrieval system allows the user to "select a desired relational quality that causes an indication of which objects or content shares the same relation with the source material").

*Claim 29:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 25, further comprising the step of recommending secondary materials based on a selection of relational information by a user (see Column 7, Lines 41-52; see Column 8, Line 3 through Column 9, Line 13 — the information retrieval system "recommends secondary materials" based on a

“selection of relational information by a user” in that it computes a probability of relevance based on the threshold relevance value entered by the user).

*Claim 30:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein a citation matrix is derived from the database of linkages between the objects and the storage medium (see Column 8, Lines 5-29; see Column 14, Lines 48-55; see Table 1 in Columns 15 and 16 — Goffman discloses this limitation in that the database lists citation frequency data for the journals in the database).

*Claim 31:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein a cocitation matrix is derived from the database of linkages between the objects and the storage medium (see Column 8, Lines 5-29; see Column 14, Lines 48-55; see Table 1 in Columns 15 and 16 — Goffman discloses this limitation in that the database lists citation frequency data for the journals in the database; thus, the “relevance values” for any two “other” journals increases according to the number of times these two particular “other” journals are cited in the “starter” journal).

*Claim 35:*

Goffman discloses a method of producing a storage medium that provides information regarding a source material (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, Goffman discloses this limitation), comprising the steps of:

- gathering features of the source material (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, Goffman discloses this limitation);
- accessing secondary materials related to the features (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, Goffman discloses this limitation);
- determining attributes of the secondary materials, wherein the source material, the features of the source material, the secondary materials, and the attributes of the secondary materials can be objects of the storage medium (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2; see Column 14, Lines 34-47 — the “attributes” of the “secondary materials” include the “relevance values,” which are “determined” by the information retrieval system; the “starter” journal, the “other” journals, the citations of additional journals, and the “relevance values” are “characterized as objects of the storage medium” in that the information retrieval system is part of a computer network; in other words, each of these elements is an “object” that is manipulated by the computer network);
- creating a matrix that indicates relationships between each secondary material or attribute and one or both of the source material or the feature of the source material (see Column 8, Lines 5-29; see Column 14, Lines 48-55; see Table 1 in

Columns 15 and 16 — Goffman discloses this limitation in that database includes citation frequency data for the journals in the database); and

- generating an extended document (see Figures 4 and 5; see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2; see Tables 1-10 in Columns 15-20 – the “extended document” is generated and recorded in the digraphs, tables and trees, as described in the cited text and figures), the extended document including information related to the source material and a database of linkages between the objects of the storage medium (see Figures 4-12; see Column 4, Line 51 through Column 5, Line 10; see Column 14, Lines 34-47; see Tables 1-10 in Columns 15-20 – the “extended document” includes “information related to the source material and a database of linkages between the objects of the storage medium” in that the information recorded in the tables, digraphs and trees pertain to the relevance between the various journals and a numerical measure of that relevance).

*Claim 37:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 35, wherein the extended document is provided as a function of similarity between the information related to the source material and the source material (the information retrieval system discloses this limitation in that its whole purpose is to determine the relevance of the “other” journals with respect to the “starter” journal).

*Claim 38:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 37, wherein the similarity is determined based on the level of relationship between the provided information and the source material (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, Goffman discloses a "threshold relevance value;" the information retrieval system "determines similarity based on the level of relationship between the provided information and the source material" in that it retrieves only those journals that meets the threshold).

*Claim 40:*

Goffman discloses the method of Claim 35, wherein the information related to the source material includes relational information between the source material or one or more of the secondary materials and at least one of the gathered features, the determined attributes or the predetermined characteristic, and wherein the relational information is used in the provision of the information contained within the storage medium (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2; see Column 14, Lines 34-47 — the information retrieval system discloses this limitation in that the "information related to" the "starter" journal includes "relational information" between the "starter" journal and the "other" journals; as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, the information retrieval system includes "relational information" that is provided via a graphical user interface).

Claims 5-9, 14-17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawrence et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,289,342.

*Claim 5:*

Lawrence discloses a method of providing an interface for graphically displaying information (see Figures 2-7 – Lawrence discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures), comprising the steps of:

- displaying information regarding a source material and a set of secondary materials on a graphical user interface (see Figure 5 – Lawrence discloses this limitation in that the citation indexing system includes the user interface shown in Figure 5, which displays “source material” at the top, and “secondary materials” at the bottom);
- determining a selection of information based on a user input (see Column 11, Lines 15-37 – Lawrence discloses this limitation in that the citation indexing system allows the user to click on “Details” for one of the citations; thus, a “selection of information” is “determined” “based on a user input”);
- analyzing the source material, the set of secondary materials, and the selection of information in a manner that yields relational information between the source material or one or more secondary materials and at least one of the selection of information or the information regarding the source material (see Column 2, Line 45 through Column 3, Line 21; see Column 16, Line 5 through Column 18, Line 53 – Lawrence discloses this limitation in that prior art citation indexing systems allows the user to navigate the citations forward and backward in time, to find out

where and how often a particular article is cited in a database of articles, to search citations according to keywords, and to provide detailed analyses of a group of articles; Lawrence also discloses this limitation in that the citation indexing system analyzes a source document and a group of other documents to determine those other documents that are most related to the source document, as clearly described in the cited text; also, the citation indexing system performs the analysis based on user input; thus, the citation indexing system “analyzes the source material, the set of secondary materials, and the selection of information” in a manner that yields “relational information” between the “source material” and the “information regarding the source materials”);

- updating the display of information regarding the source material and the set of secondary materials via change in graphical indicia on a virtual board such that one or more representations of information relating to at least one of the source material or the secondary materials are capable of arrangement as a function of the relational information (see Column 11, Lines 15-37; see Figures 5-7 – Lawrence discloses this limitation in that the citation indexing system allows the user to view a source document and the documents that cite the source document and to navigate the documents; for example, in Figure 5, the user can view the documents that cite the source document by clicking on “Details;” for another example, in Figures 6 and 7, the user can view the documents that cite one of the documents that cite the source document by clicking on “Details” for any of the listed documents that cite the source document; thus, the citation

indexing system “updates the display of information” regarding the “source material” and the “set of secondary materials” via change in “graphical indicia on a virtual board” such that representations of information are “capable of arrangement” “as a function of relational information”).

*Claim 6:*

Lawrence discloses the method according to Claim 5, wherein the updating step highlights a particular set of the secondary materials, so as to bring the particular set of the secondary materials to the attention of the user (the citation chosen by the user is a “particular set of the secondary materials,” and it is “highlighted” and brought “to the attention of the user” in that either the complete citation document is displayed or the documents that cite the citation document are displayed).

*Claim 7:*

Lawrence discloses the method according to Claim 5, wherein the displaying step includes displaying a representation of objects of the source material in a first area and displaying a representation of objects of the secondary materials in a second area (see Figure 5 – the “representation of objects” of the source material is at the top, and the “representation of objects” of the secondary materials is at the bottom).

*Claim 8:*

Lawrence discloses the method according to Claim 7, wherein the updating step rearranges the locations of the representations of the objects of the secondary materials (the locations of the “representation of objects” of the secondary materials are “rearranged” in that, when the user clicks on “Details” for one of the citations, the citation indexing system “updates the display” by presenting the cited document in the context of the citation).

*Claim 9:*

Lawrence discloses the method according to Claim 7, further comprising the step of:

- linking the first area and the second area so that a user input to either area will effect the display in the other area (the first area and the second area are both “linked” in that the user can click on hypertext in either area; once the user clicks on the hypertext in either area, the display in the other area is “effected” in that a new display screen is presented to the user).

*Claims 14-17:*

Claims 14-17 merely recite a graphical user interface that performs the method specified in Claims 5 and 7-9, respectively. Thus, Lawrence discloses every limitation of Claims 14-17, using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 5 and 7-9.

*Claim 24:*

Claim 24 merely recites computer software that performs the method specified in Claim 5. Thus, Lawrence discloses every limitation of Claim 24, using the same rationale indicated in the above rejection for Claim 5.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 32-34, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goffman, in view of Pirolli et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,835,905.

*Claim 32:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Goffman discloses every limitation of Claim 25.

Goffman fails to expressly disclose:

- performing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium for inclusion into the extended document.

Pirolli teaches a method of producing a storage medium that provides information related to a source material (see Column 1, Line 65 through Column 2, Line 37 — Pirolli teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), comprising the step of:

- performing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium for inclusion into the extended document (see Column 10, Lines 1-54 — Pirolli teaches this limitation in that the document analysis system includes a focus document – a particular web page – for which a “spreading activation” is performed to predict the relevance of other documents using link topology and text similarity),  
for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document (see Column 1, Lines 17-19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Goffman to include the step of:

- performing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium for inclusion into the extended document,  
for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document, as taught in Pirolli.

*Claim 33:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Goffman discloses every limitation of Claim 25.

Goffman fails to expressly disclose:

- executing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium, the spreading activation procedure providing information as a function of user-provided relational information.

Pirolli teaches a method of producing a storage medium that provides information related to a source material (see Column 1, Line 65 through Column 2, Line 37 — Pirolli teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), comprising the step of:

- executing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium (see Column 10, Lines 1-54 — Pirolli teaches this limitation in that the document analysis system includes a focus document — a particular web page — for which a “spreading activation” is performed to predict the relevance of other documents using link topology and text similarity), the spreading activation procedure providing information as a function of user-provided relational information (the document analysis system begins the “spreading activation” at a focus document that is input by the user),

for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document (see Column 1, Lines 17-19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Goffman to include the step of:

- executing a spreading activation procedure to provide information from the storage medium, the spreading activation procedure providing information as a function of user-provided relational information,

for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document, as taught in Pirolli.

*Claim 34:*

Goffman discloses relational information that is specified as a certain level of relationship between the provided information and the source material (see Column 7, Line 3 through Column 8, Line 2 — as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 25, the “threshold relevance value” is input by the user and the information retrieval system analyzes the relevance of the “other” journals to the “starter” journal according to the “threshold relevance value;” thus, the user specifies a “certain level of relationship” between the “user-provided information” and the information provided by the analysis).

*Claim 36:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Goffman discloses every limitation of Claim 35.

Goffman fails to expressly disclose relational information related to the source material that is determined as a function of a spreading activation procedure.

Pirolli teaches a method of producing a storage medium that provides information related to a source material (see Column 1, Line 65 through Column 2, Line 37 — Pirolli teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), wherein relational information related to the source material is determined as a function of a spreading activation procedure (see Column 10, Lines 1-54 — Pirolli teaches this limitation in that

the document analysis system includes a focus document – a particular web page – for which a “spreading activation” is performed to predict the relevance of other documents using link topology and text similarity; thus, the “spreading activation” determines “relational information related to the source material”), for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document (see Column 1, Lines 17-19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Goffman to include relational information related to the source material that is determined as a function of a spreading activation procedure, for the purpose of predicting documents of relevance to a focus document, as taught in Pirolli.

*Claim 39:*

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 38, Goffman discloses determining similarity based on the level of relationship between the provided information and the source material.

Thus, when the “spreading activation” is performed in the method disclosed in Goffman, in view of Pirolli, it will be executed as “function of the level of relationship between the provided information and the source material.”

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3 September 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

*Arguments for Claims 5-9, 14-17 and 24:39*

Applicant argues that Lawrence fails to disclose or suggest a "virtual board" or "graphical indicia" on said board because Lawrence only operates to provide the source document and/or a list of documents derived by means of predefined search mechanisms. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 9, second paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The citation indexing system in Lawrence displays, on a computer screen, both a source document and those documents that cite the source document (see Figures 6 and 7). Thus, the citation indexing system discloses "graphical indicia" on a "virtual board." That is, the text shown on the computer screens (see Figures 6 and 7) is "graphical indicia" and the entire display shown on the computer screen is the "virtual board."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH  
September 26, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100**